## MEETING

# STATE OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

ROBERT F. CARLSON AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2017 2:17 P.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

## APPEARANCES

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- Ms. Theresa Taylor, Chairperson
- Ms. Priya Mathur, Vice Chairperson
- Mr. Michael Bilbrey
- Mr. Rob Feckner
- Ms. Dana Hollinger
- Mr. Henry Jones
- Mr. Bill Slaton

## BOARD MEMBERS:

- Mr. John Chiang, represented by Mr. Frank Moore
- Mr. Richard Gillihan, represented by Ms. Katie Hagen
- Mr. Ron Lind
- Ms. Betty Yee, represented by Mr. Alan Lofaso

### STAFF:

- Ms. Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer
- Mr. Ted Eliopoulos, Chief Investment Officer
- Mr. Doug Hoffner, Deputy Executive Officer
- Mr. Matt Jacobs, General Counsel
- Ms. Marlene Timberlake D'Adamo, Interim Chief Financial Officer
- Ms. Kristen Garner, Committee Secretary

	INDEX	PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1
2.	Election of Board Governance Committee Chair and Vice Chair	2
3.	Executive Report	5
4.	Consent Items Action Consent Items: a. Approval of the December 20, 2016 Board Governance Committee Meeting Minutes b. Annual Review of Board Governance Committee Delegation	6
5.	Consent Items Information Consent Items: a. Annual Calendar Review b. Parking Lot Review	6
Action Agenda Items		
6.	Proposed Revision to Public Comment Form	6
Information Agenda Items		
7.	Update on Board Education Program	6
8.	Proposed Revisions to Board Governance Policy Regarding Board Member Representation on Outside Boards	10
9.	Responsibility for Creating/Disbanding Committees (standing, ad hoc, sub)	3 0
10.	Distinction Between Policies and Procedures	33
11.	Summary of Committee Direction	38
12.	Public Comment	38
Adj	ournment	38
Reporter's Certificate		39

# 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 CHAIRPERSON SLATON: Okay. I'd like to call the 3 Board Governance meeting to order. 4 There's no -- I guess there's no gavel. Again, 5 budget cuts, what can I say? 6 (Laughter.) 7 CHAIRPERSON SLATON: Okay. So we'll now do the 8 roll call, please. 9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Michael Bilbrey? 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY: Here. COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Rob Feckner? 11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Good afternoon. 12 13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Dana Hollinger? 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Here. 15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Henry Jones? 16 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Here. 17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Priya Mathur? COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Here. 18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Bill Slaton? 19 20 CHAIRPERSON SLATON: Here. COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Theresa Taylor? 21 COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Here. 22 23 CHAIRPERSON SLATON: Okay. And let's see Frank 24 is here and Ron Lind is here and who else? Katie Hagen, 25 Alan Lofaso. So thanks for all -- all of you for joining.

So we'll move to election of the Board Governance Committee Chair and Vice Chair. And for this, I'll turn it over to Mr. Jones.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. Nominations are now open for election of the Chair for Board Governance Committee.

Mrs. Hollinger.

COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Yeah. I'd like to nominate Bill Slaton. I feel he's really served us so well and really governed us through some tough waters. So I want to put in the nomination for Bill Slaton as Chair.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. Are there any further nominations?

Yeah, Mrs. Mathur.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you. I would like to Nominate Ms. Taylor to serve as Chair of the Committee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. So it's been nominated -- Ms. Taylor has been nominated. And Mr. Slaton has been nominated.

Are there any further nominations?

Are there any further nominations?

Are there any further nominations?

So hearing none -- no additional nominations, so we will take a vote on these 2 candidates. And we'll do

3

```
1
    like we did the last time, just start and go around and
    say who you're for starting with Bill.
 2
3
             CHAIRPERSON SLATON: Oh, I think I'll vote for
 4
   myself.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.
5
 6
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY:
                                        Ms. Taylor.
7
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER:
                                        Taylor.
8
             COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER:
                                          Slaton.
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Slaton
10
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Taylor
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Myself.
12
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. Ms. Taylor
    congratulations. You're the new -- okay.
13
14
             (Applause.)
15
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So now, I'm going to turn
16
    this over for the nomination for Vice Chair.
17
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: You run it.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: You move over here.
18
19
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay.
20
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Or she could stay here
21
   too.
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah, we don't have the
22
23
   screen.
2.4
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: True.
25
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So I'd like to take
```

4

```
1
   nominations for Vice Chair?
 2
             So I've got Rob first.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: I nominate Ms. Mathur.
 3
 4
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. I have a nomination
    for Ms. Mathur for Vice Chair.
5
6
             Any more nominations?
7
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I nominate Ms.
8
   Hollinger.
9
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So we have Ms. Hollinger
10
   nominated for Vice Chair and Ms. Mathur.
11
             So I guess we'll do the same thing?
             Any further nominations?
12
13
             That's my third time, right?
14
             (Laughter.)
15
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Any further nominations?
16
             All right. We're going to go around the room
17
    starting with myself.
             I'll vote for Mathur.
18
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Mathur.
19
20
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES:
                                      Hollinger.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER:
                                           Hollinger.
21
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER:
22
                                         Mathur.
23
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY:
                                        Mathur.
2.4
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Hollinger.
25
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. It looks like --
```

congratulations, Ms. Mathur, you are now Vice Chair.

All right. So moving right along. We are -- excuse me, let me get this a little closer because I'm turning away the other way.

So I guess we are on the executive report.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes, we are.

Good afternoon, Chair Taylor and Vice Chair
Mathur. And congratulations on your elections. I look
forward to working with both of you as we go forward with
the Board Governance Committee and everything that we're
trying to do with the Committee.

I don't have a lot to add to the agenda today. I did want to report on Form 700 compliance. All Board Members who were required to have their Form 700s filed by March 1st are in compliance.

I did also want to suggest that Agenda Item 7, which is the update on the Board Education Program be moved to the Information Consent Agenda. That's just something that you folks can decide upon, but it didn't appear to me to be worthy of a separate presentation.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: And then the other thing
I just wanted to report. We have our first 2 quarters
under our belt under the new travel reporting policy. And
the cumulative totals for those first 2 quarters are

```
$80,000 in ex -- travel expenses for Board members;
1
    $460,000 in travel expenses for staff.
 2
 3
             So that's my executive report.
 4
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: All right. Thank you very
   much, Mr. Jacobs.
5
6
             We are moving on to consent item number 4,
7
    approval of the December 20th, 2016 Board Governance
8
    Committee meetings --
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Move approval.
10
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: -- minutes -- meeting
11
   minutes and the delegation.
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Second.
12
13
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: All those in favor?
14
             All those opposed?
15
             Okay.
                    It passes.
16
             On top of that, Consent Items number 5, we didn't
17
   move number 7 up into the consent items, right.
18
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: You can do it
19
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So I'm moving 7, Update on
20
    Board Education Program, up to Consent Item number 5 for
    information -- this is informational consent items. So we
21
22
    don't need to go any further.
23
             And -- hold on. Action agenda items, Proposed
```

This is Agenda

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes.

Revision to the Public Comment Form.

24

25

Item 6. The item covers a potential change to the public comment form to give speakers an opportunity to indicate on the form that they believe that they need more than the 3 minutes that has been allocated pursuant to the regulation that the Board passed in December -- finally in December.

Staff is agnostic on the matter, and so it's really for the Committee, at this point, to discuss and decide. We did propose some language that we believe would accomplish the goal that was suggested by one of the Board members -- or one of the Committee members. So that's before you as Attachment 2.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Ms. Mathur.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Thank you.

I'm the one who made this recommendation, and I think it was -- well, it was really in response to some feedback we had received from some of our stakeholders. And I do think it's important to at least give people -- give individuals the opportunity to express if they need more time. It still would be at -- I think at the discretion of the Chair.

I think it might be worth noting on the form that they must -- they must submit the form in advance in order to request additional time, because all speakers on that item would have -- would be afforded the same amount of

time. So I think it's -- we should make that explicit in the form.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah, that's not explicit right now, so can we --

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Go ahead. I had I think Rob, right, and then Henry.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: You want to press your mic, Rob.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: I am -- for one, I'm opposed to this -- this new part of the process. I think that it -- I don't see any that's going to come up there and say they don't want more time, first of all. I think any -- everybody is going to request that, whether they use it or not.

I think it was back in December, the Chair gave latitude for up to 10 minutes. Nobody used more than 5. So I think that we're setting ourselves up for a bigger problem than we already have. And so just from my opinion, I think that it's going a little too far down the field, from where I'm comfortable in going.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Mr. Jones.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah, I have the same sentiment as Rob. I think it's -- it creates perhaps more confusion than solving the problem.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So -- and I'm also going to speak on this. In addition to that, I think that the Chair of the Committee is free to award extra time, so -- for example, I think wasn't it last meeting we gave everybody 5 minutes for Investment Committee, yeah. So I agree, but -- do I take a vote. Is this a vote?

Anybody else?

I didn't see anybody else's hands.

Oh, Bill.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: I just say I agree with President Feckner. I think you just -- you start to create a problem for yourself by doing that. And we've -- we have a regulation that gives enough discretion to the chair to adjust as needed.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I would like to speak on that.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Go ahead.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: So I hear all of the points that are made by my fellow Committee members. And I'm sensing the tenor of the Committee is not with me on this. I think right now, if an individual wanted additional time, they would have to speak directly to the Chair. And not everyone would feel comfortable to do that, or would have the relationship with the Chair to do that. Whereas, having a form that is available to

everyone is more democratic.

And I don't think most people would use it. I think most people would be respectful of the Board's time. And I think we've seen that when we've allotted additional time. But I do -- I do hear the opposition of the rest of the Committee, so I guess I won't move it at this time. But anyway.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: All right. Thank you.

So it sounds like we're going to stick with the original proposal. And that form is on Attachment 1 correct?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: The existing form. Okay.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. So there's no

15 | motion one way or the other on this one.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: She did not make a motion.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: All right. So --

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Moving on.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Go ahead.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Moving on to Agenda Item 8. This item reflects an attempt by Mr. Slaton and my staff to arrive at language that we thought reflected the consensus from the December of 2016 meeting regarding a

policy on Board member representation on outside boards.

The proposed revisions are reflected in the red-lined form of the Board Governance Committee -- excuse me, the Board Governance Policy at page 21.

And I'll just read it for convenience sake. We would add new section that says "Service on outside..." -- I guess we should put boards, "....Board members shall obtain Board approval prior to accepting service on an outside board related to CalPERS. Each Board member should first confer with the Board President regarding the proposed position. The request to serve on the outside board will then be placed on the agenda for approval at the Board's next regularly scheduled public meeting".

So that is the proposal.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So any -- I have -- I don't know who raised their hands first. So I'm going to go with Priya, and then Michael, and then Bill.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I think it's fair -I'm fairly comfortable with the language. The only
thing -- my only question is whether an outside board is a
term of art, and whether it would be generally understood
what that means, or whether we should be a little bit more
explicit about what that means, so that -- you know,
define the term or say that, you know, on a board of
another organization, or something for -- anyway, that's
my question. I don't know, Matt, if it's --

12

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Well, I think as it --1 VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: -- a broadly understood 2 3 term already. 4 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: As it currently reads, 5 the way I read it is anything outside of CalPERS. 6 VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Um-hmm. 7 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: But if a Committee 8 prefers to be more specific, we can certainly come up with 9 some more language. 10 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Rob. 11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: You know, I agree with where Ms. Mathur --12 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Mic. 14 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Mic. 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: I agree where Ms. 16 Mathur is heading. But given that description by Mr. 17 Jacobs, what if say I was going to serve on the Muscular 18 Dystrophy Board. So I think we need to be clear that it 19 has to be something that's related to CalPERS, because we 20 can't -- we shouldn't be putting guidelines in place that 21 aren't something that's going to affect our tenure sitting

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Right, and those are the next words.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Okay.

22

23

24

25

on this Board.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: "Outside board related to Calpers".

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Michael.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY: My question, I know it specifically says boards, what about working groups, advisory committees, et cetera, does that apply to this as well?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: You know, it's hard to say in general. I think that if there's -- if -- I think the way to think about this would be if, in your mind, it raises a question, then you just run it by the Board President. The Board President might say that's not -- we don't -- you don't need my approval for that.

But without knowing, Mr. Bilbrey, specifically what the situation is, it's kind of hard to improve on that definition.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Mr. Slaton.

actually, I would respectfully disagree with Matt in one respect. I think that if it's an advisory board, to me that's really no different than a board position. If you are making -- assuming, they meet in public, and you are representing Calpers in the opinions that you express, to me that's representing Calpers, even though it may not be

a voting board position. It's an advisory board.

that.

So I would encourage adding the language including advisory boards, et cetera. But again, we have the words that say "related to CalPERS". So I think maybe that gets to the point. If you're going to represent CalPERS, then whatever that role is, then we need to have some process.

The second thing I would raise, which is not included in this language is -- and I don't know if we -- if the committee wants to wrestle with this issue or not, but how long should people serve? You know, we go through a process where on our boards that -- of the companies we own. We have recommended terms for that. We don't want someone being on a board for 20 years.

And so the question is, if it's good enough for that, what should our process be here for how long an individual Board member should serve on an outside board?

So right now we don't address that. And I think that, in my opinion, we should find someway to address

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Mr. Jones.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. On that point, perhaps, we can use the criteria that we use for corporate boards, 12 years. And that may be something to consider for us serving on outside boards, 12 years.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Ms. Mathur.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: You know, I don't know that we -- I know that we have 12 years in our -- now our Governance and Sustainability Guidelines. I'm not sure that we actual -- in practice, that everybody who serves longer than 12 years should be off the Board. I think it's more about the average tenure of the Board, how much refreshment there is on a board. Because somebody could be serving for 12 or 15 years and be adding a lot of value, be offering institutional knowledge. Whereas, somebody else could be sitting on 12 years, and be completely captive to the CEO, and no longer independent in any way. And so I guess I'm not so sure that having a hard and fast limit is the best way to go.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Well --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Go ahead, Bill.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: -- maybe it would be appropriate that it be a guidelines, so that there's -- we're actually stating that we have in mind that you don't serve on boards in perpetuity. So maybe a guideline would be a little softer where -- and maybe the only way to enforce a guideline is really for the President or someone else is to review it periodically, what the length of service has been, and whether it needs to change.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Can I ask? Mr. Jacobs, I

was wondering, do we have the ability legally to determine how long somebody can serve on an outside board?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Well, insofar as you're representing CalPERS's interests on that outside board, I'd have to say yes.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Okay. I just wanted to make sure that was the case.

And then if we were to make it a guideline, it wouldn't go in this language, correct?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Well, I'd have to add something.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay.

2.4

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I mean -- yeah.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I'm sorry. Ron.

BOARD MEMBER LIND: I was just going to suggest some committee might consider -- you know, since the Board has to approve somebody serving on the outside board, maybe it comes up for review every 3 years, or 4 years, or 2 years. You know, just to again have the Board approve you're continuing on the outside board.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Rather than putting it in the language Ron, is that what you mean, or putting it in the language and having that part of the language?

BOARD MEMBER LIND: However it best works. It probably should be in the language. If you're going to --

if the Board is going to approve somebody serving, then the Board should also -- it also should be in the language that the Board looks at it every whatever the time period is.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Rob.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Yes. Thank you. And since this is just an informational item. It will come back later after being massaged. One thing I want to throw out there is that I have concern about an outside agency denoting who's going to sit on that board. So I think if an organization is looking for a Board member, they should approach Calpers and say we would like a Board member, and then this Board decides who it's going to be, not somebody else denoting who it was.

So we would say, geez, you know, PPI has an opening, who's interested? And then that group of people talks about it and we pick one of those folks that's interested, not have the outside agency decide who they're going to have.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Alan.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER LOFASO: Thanks, Madam Chair. Apropos to this represent, I thought the tenor of the discussion in December was quote related to CalPERS, generally speaking, meant that CalPERS was supporting the travel costs. Is that what related to CalPERS generally

means in this context?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I seem to recall --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I think it means represent

4 | CalPERS on a board, right?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yeah, but I think that Ms. Lofaso's definition or, what would you call it, a way to discern what is in and what is out is a good one. And I have some vague recollection that we discussed it.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So say that again, Alan?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: So the basic idea, if I could get this correct --

ACTING BOARD MEMBER LOFASO: Please.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: -- is that the way to define related to CalPERS is would it be something that CalPERS would pay for the Board member's travel expenses for.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. And we can put that in the language.

Dana.

COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Oh, all I was going to say is I think on some of these outside boards different ones of us have different expertise. We come from different backgrounds. Also, Ms. Feckner, right now, you know, a lot of -- a lot of these boards sometimes are supporting gender diversity. So it may eliminate some of

our members, because there's different factors that I would be reluctant to put a general guideline, because there are sometime different factors in each of our backgrounds that would make some of us a better fit on certain boards than others.

2.4

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Mr. Slaton, and then Frank.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Yeah. I think -- you know, I think, Dana, you've raised an interesting point. But I think if that -- if that holds up, then there's wisdom of the group here that that comes out, and the person who has that particular expertise would probably get that permission from CalPERS to go ahead and join it, because the rationale would be there. So I don't see that as being a blocking factor for doing a Board approval for it.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And I've got Frank wanted to make a comment.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER MOORE: What's -- what is the purpose of the language that requires the Board member to first confer with the Board president? And does the Board President have the ability to not forward the nomination to the full Board.

The answer is no?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: If you're asking me, I

would hope not. I think the Board President would just give counsel and advice, because maybe it doesn't fit.

And you'd have that discussion, then they would choose not to move it forward. But if they choose to move it forward, I would hope the President would automatically send it to the Board.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER MOORE: That's my understanding. That's what I wanted to know.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Henry.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. So what happens if the organization requests a specific Board member to serve on their Board, and it comes through the process and it's declined. So that organization may suggest, well, we wanted that person on our board. And if you're not going to be able to serve, then we'll go to another pension fund? Because I know -- and the reason I say that is because I'm the Board of PPI, and that's -- we're looking for talent from different sizes of funds, large funds, small funds, CIOs and CEOs, et cetera. And so when an opening comes, we go to look for that kind of person on that -- from that particular fund.

So it creates a potential problem if then the Board -- our Board says no, we're going to have someone else serve in that capacity. So just raising it.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Mr. Slaton.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: I would say it's the same issue. If that's the rationale, then that's part of our decision process as to how to fill it.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Ms. Mathur.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I agree with Henry.

And actually, I think it's addressed already by the

Board's approval authority. The Board could just say, no,

we don't want that person to serve in that capacity, and

so we're not going to support that. And then if it's

something like CII, for example, where we get to -- we can

nominate a candidate, then we nominate a candidate -
somebody else.

But if it's something like PPI, which is by invitation, it's a -- it's a different type of board, so I think -- that's -- I guess that's my view.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Mr. Feckner.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Yeah, and I agree with that it's by invitation, but it's by invitation to Calpers. The wouldn't be invited if you weren't sitting on the Calpers Board, so Calpers should be making the decision, not the individual. Just my opinion.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Who was next?

Oh, I'm sorry. Katie.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER HAGEN: I'm just trying to --

in light of this discussion, I was trying to figure out how if we were to go down that path of having a board -- the Board decide who sits on various board invitations, what would be the process for that? I mean, would it be in open session? I'm just having a hard time understanding how you would be selected.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Good question.

would be, as currently written, would be that, let's say, Ms. Mathur asks to be on a new board, she would go to Mr. Feckner. They'd have their conversation, and then it would go onto the agenda, as presumably a consent item. But if board members thought that it should -- it was debatable or controversial, that they could pull it off consent and have a discussion about it and take a vote.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And I just had one other question as well, myself. What -- what prompted this language change? What I'm -- was there a problem or is it just because we think it should come to the Board before anybody accepts a position? Is that just what prompted the discussion?

Rob.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: I'll bring it up. And Bill and I've talked about this before. We get a lot of requests to come, and we're spending CalPERS Trust Fund

money on these positions, that if there's no follow-through -- I mean, we need to have some kind of guidance versus somebody just saying, oh, I want to do this. I want to do this. I want to do this.

The Board needs to be able to have that rationalization of if we're going to make this expenditure, then we are going to authorize this position. Up until now, we haven't had that. It's just been kind of at-will. And I think we need to have a structure.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. And anybody else?

Bill, did you have your hand up a minute ago?

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Well, I was just going to reiterate the same thing, that we -- it was kind of ad hoc. And there is no process associated with it. So just trying to be consistent and have a process, so everybody understands what the rules are. And, you know, we live with it. It's not designed to -- really to up-end what has been happening. It's just to put some form and structure around it.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Ms. Mathur.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Well, I just want to say I think it is a good idea to have a process. And that way everyone knows exactly what they need to do. And I actually think the process as outlined here is simple and effective, and accomplishes, I think, pretty much

everything that people have raised.

Now, with respect -- with respect to tenure on a particular board, usually the boards themselves have tenure requirements or terms. And so each time an individual would have to come and get reauthorization. For example, I'll just use the PRI board has the maximum of the 3-year terms. So each time I would have to come and get approval from the CalPERS Board to get -- to be reauthorized to sit on the Board.

So that is sort of a natural way I think. If we set a time, 4 years might be off the timing of that organization. It would be awkward to be 1 year into your second term and be re -- have to reconsider whether you're eligible to sit.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: So are you saying maybe the word should say that before serving any additional -- an additional term, you would have to come back for approval by the Board?

 $\mbox{ \begin{tabular}{lllll} VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: & I guess I thought that \\ \mbox{ \ensuremath{was} implicit in this.} \end{tabular}$ 

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah, I did too.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Maybe this is only talking about the outset, but it does seem that for -- it seems appropriate to me that for continued service you would -- for each subsequent term, you would --

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Well, then we should put that into words, so it's not just, you know, we think that's the case, because the words aren't there right now.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Well --

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I mean is accepting service -- I guess I saw -- I though accepting service as meaning for each -- each term, but --

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Right, but you wouldn't have a problem with specific wording as long as it's tied to the organizational term --

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Absolutely.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: -- not to us.

So I'd suggest maybe the Chair could direct Matt to do that.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So it sounds to me like -first of all, there were other suggestions for language
change. But this specific thing is a reauthorization, if
we could add that in, for every term that you update on
the same board. So like Priya said, PRI for her is three
3-year terms. So when she comes up for her next
third-year term, she would have to have it authorized, but
I guess what everybody is saying is it probably should say
that in here.

Right now, she thought it was implicit, but I don't think it is either. It just says that we have to

1 get authorization. It doesn't say for reauthorization.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Sure. Yeah, we can wordsmith that.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. Was there --

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: There's some other suggestions though that it's unclear to me whether it was the consensus of the Committee or not. So let me just go through them.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Sure.

2.4

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Add the reference to

Board travel or the request that Calpers reimburse the

Board travel as a criterion for the -- for whether it's a

board that requires this approval?

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Well, I think we said no on that, because it says on an outside board related to Calpers. Am I correct, everyone?

It already says that in the verbiage.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Yeah, there may be a board -- there may be a board in your own town where there's no travel expense involved.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: So the same thing would apply.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. So not that one.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay.

And Michael. Mr. Bilbrey

COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY: Just for an example, I sit on a work group of -- that are global, so we -- most of our is all calls. We might meet every other year or try to, but 15 different countries, we obviously can't meet regularly, so they do phone calls like quarterly or so.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Ms. Mathur.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Yeah. So I guess the question is whether you're representing CalPERS' interests or whether -- or whether it's just about the money? And I -- so I guess that's -- that's the real question. That's sort of what you're getting at is -- I don't know --

that mean? Do you want it on there to be very specific?

VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I mean, we could go

there -- we could go there in terms of speaking -- I mean,
speaking engagements have to be approved too, I suppose.

So that -- so maybe that would be more consistent if
you're sitting on a committee, even if it's by phone or
virtual, then you --

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So I don't know, what does

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And then you go to a speaking engagement.

28

```
1
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: -- and you're
 2
    representing CalPERS interests.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: I think it's
 3
 4
    representing CalPERS interests. I think that's the
5
    driver, regardless of the money.
6
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: I agree. I don't think
7
    it's -- I mean, the money is important, but it's less.
8
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So we're still staying with
9
    the same language then, is that what we're saying, serve
10
    on an outside board related to CalPERS?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Yes.
11
12
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay.
                                         Next.
13
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. Let's see what
14
    else I've got. Are we -- did we want to adopt the
15
    addition of including advisory boards?
16
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: (Nods head.)
17
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I think everybody greed on
18
    that one.
19
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. And then
20
    something about a -- I know we've addressed the -- every
21
    time that you get re-upped, you go through the process,
22
    but did we want to say thinking about the term limit, or
23
    term limit principle?
2.4
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I think we didn't come to an
25
    agreement on that, so I'm going to say no.
```

29

```
GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS:
1
                                      Okay.
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I'm seeing shaking heads, so
 2
3
   no.
 4
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. And this may be
5
    unnecessary in light of what we just discussed with
6
    respect to re-upping every term, but there was some
7
    comment, I think, about the Board reviewing all of the
8
    assignments, or all of the committee-ships, memberships
9
    every 3 or 4 years.
10
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: No, because we --
11
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: That was addressed by
    the --
12
13
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah.
14
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: -- the -- that every --
15
    every new term gets reviewed.
16
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Right.
17
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. So I think I have
18
    enough.
19
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I think Michael -- Mr.
20
   Bilbrey.
21
             COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY: Although you may want
22
    to say -- because some of them may not have term limits,
23
    or whatever, so you may want to say either on their --
24
    when they're -- if there's a renewal for a board or every
    3 years, if there's no --
25
```

1 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I'm sorry, Michael COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY: So I was saying not 2 3 every group may have a renewal period --4 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Right. 5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY: -- so you may want to 6 put language that says either on renewal or every 3 years 7 by the Board or something like that. 8 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Does that sound good? 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Yeah. 10 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah. 11 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. All right. Well, I think I have enough --12 13 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Was that everything? 14 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: -- to redraft. So what 15 I would suggest is that we'll put it back on next month as 16 a -- an informational item or a consent item. 17 there's still some discussion that needs to be had with respect to the wording, that we'll pull it off and discuss 18 19 it. How does that sound? 20 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Perfect. Thank you. 21 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay. Good. 22 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: All right. We're moving on 23 to number 9, Responsibility for Creating and Disbanding 24 Committees, standing, ad hoc, and subcommittees. 25 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yeah. This arises from

the fact that we noticed -- Mr. Slaton noticed quite awhile ago that the Board Governance Committee delegation reads that the -- that "The Board Governance Committee is authorized to quote approve Board/Committee roles, including creating and disbanding standing and ad hoc committees", which raises the question of whether that's where it should be with the -- with this Committee, or whether that responsibility should really be with the Board.

And then there's another question about what about subcommittees, should those -- should responsibilities for creating and disbanding those also be with the Board or perhaps with the Committee to which the subcommittee would report? So I think that's how we got here, and that's open for discussion.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah. Yes, Henry.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah, on the subcommittees, I would suggest that it's the Committee that authorizes the subcommittee with the concurrence of the President.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Anybody else on that?
Mr. Slaton.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: I would take a just slightly different tact. I think it does -- I think the first pass should be the Committee of interest, but then I

32

```
1
    think it should be like anything else, subject to approval
    of the Board. Now, you can get into the Investment
 2
 3
    Committee, which is a Committee of the whole. And maybe
 4
    in that particular case, you don't need approval of the
5
   Board. But I think in other Committees, if you're going
6
    to form a subcommittee, I think ultimately it should, like
7
    any other business conducted by that Committee, come to
8
    the full Board.
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'm good with that.
10
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. That sounds like
   everybody agrees to that. Nodding heads.
11
12
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Okay.
13
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And then the other question
14
   which was?
15
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Whether it should reside
16
   with the --
17
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: With the --
18
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: -- Board Governance
19
   Committee or with the full Board, in the first instance.
20
             VICE CHAIRPERSON MATHUR: Full Board.
21
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Full Board. That was quick
22
   and easy. There you go.
23
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: All right. All right.
24
             CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: No facilitation of
```

25

discussion necessary.

1 (Laughter.) 2 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So you're going to go back 3 and --4 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes, and I'll --5 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: -- change that language? 6 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: And I'll go through 7 that -- the same process that I just suggested with 8 respect to Agenda Item 8. We'll see if we can get 9 agreement on it. If we can't, we'll pull it off and 10 discuss it. 11 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. 12 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: And then Agenda Item 10, 13 I am going to ask Marlene Timberlake D'Adamo to come on up 14 and take over for this one. 15 INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE 16 D'ADAMO: I'm up. 17 GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Oh, there you are. All 18 right. Very good. I didn't see you there. 19 INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE 20 D'ADAMO: I snuck up while you weren't looking. 21 Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Madam Vice Chair, 22 and members of the Committee, and Board. Marlene 23 Timberlake D'Adamo, CalPERS team member. I am the Chief

Compliance Officer at CalPERS. And this item comes to you

as a result of the discussion that ensued last month at

24

25

the Finance and Administration Committee where we were talking about the delegation.

And there was a pretty detailed and lengthy conversation around policies versus procedures, because as part of the request to approve the delegation, we had requested the rescission of a policy, and adding some items to the Board Governance Policy. And there was a lot of things that were going on, and people had a lot of --members had a lot of questions around the nuances and distinctions between policies and procedures.

In your materials, there's actually 2 attachments. I know the screens aren't turned on right now, but the attachments themselves are really the framework that we use in compliance to help the organization maintain consistency with respect to our governance.

And so the first attachment, which is the pyramid, really talks about it's a pyramid, and it's a hierarchy. And at the very top are the laws, the regulations, and the professional standards that we use to make sure that we're doing things in the way that they're supposed to be done. And that's the what, essentially, if you will.

After laws and regulations and professional standards are really the delegations. And so as we talked

last month about delegations, the delegations really present the authority. So the delegations are typically for the committees or for individuals who have certain titles would say what they are required to do, and what they have the authority to do.

And delegations are generally pretty broad.

They're a very high level. They're not terribly specific in terms of the details.

The next item is where we get into policies. And we have a couple of different types of policies. We have Board policies and we have internal policies. Policies are really the what. Policies are what you must do or what you must not do. They are not meant to be very technical either, but they're really more for setting a standard or a frame of reference in terms of what needs to be done.

Procedures, essentially, are the how. Procedures tell you how you do something. They can be very operational in nature, and they can be simply how to perform a different function. They're used within the program areas, and they're really meant to say step by step how you do something.

And so one of the things that we were trying to do last month with the delegation is really to separate in that one policy that we brought forward the procedure from

the policy, because in that particular policy, it actually contained a procedure. And where we can, we really like to separate those items, because sometimes they have different audiences, sometimes they speak at different levels. So again, the policy tends to be higher level. The procedure tends to be more detailed.

And so this pyramid -- and what we're doing -- and I neglected to say this at the outset, but really the -- what we're trying to do with this pyramid, and with the way that we're doing the consistency is really to establish boundaries and guidelines, it clarifies roles and responsibilities, and it supports a strong operations management practice.

And so those are really the goals and the framework that we're trying develop -- in trying -- in developing as it relates to how we use policies, procedures, where they intersect, and how people are held accountable for them really.

The second attachment is -- it's really I look at sort of how those items are integrated. And so the first 2 boxes, the laws and regs and policies, are again telling you the standards that you're supposed to use. The procedures and the monitoring and testing is really how you measure whether or not the team is doing the things that the Board wants it to do.

And then the last 2 boxes, the reporting and the risk assessment, is really how we report back to you whether or not we're meeting those standards or those goals that you've set for us in the policies that you've determined.

So, for us, we're trying to build a framework that really is very clear about who's responsible to do what and why. And so for us, policies and procedures are very different. They serve different purposes, and they really are meant to work hand in hand in terms of how to get functional items done or functional processes done.

So, at this point, I guess I'll stop and see if anybody has any questions.

CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you for the explanation.

16 INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

17 D'ADAMO: Sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

18 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Anybody?

19 Nice job.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Cleared it up.

21 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you. Thank you.

(Laughter.)

23 INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

24 D'ADAMO: Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: This is an information item

only, yeah. So summary of Committee direction. I think Mr. Jacobs already kind of got that for us, didn't you? GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yeah, I'll come back with the language that we discussed with respect to Agenda Items 8 and 9. CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Perfect. Thank you very much. And then anybody, public comment? No, it doesn't look like it. Well, it looks like the Board Governance Committee is adjourned. (Thereupon California Public Employees' Retirement System, Board Governance Committee meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.) 

# CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System,
Board of Administration, Board Governance Committee
meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters,
a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California,
and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by
computer-assisted transcription;

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 17th day of March, 2017.

2.4

James & Tittle

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063